DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 221 524 SP 021 063

AUTHOR Denton, Jon J.; Morris, Geneva W.
TITLE A Quantitative Description of a Teacher Preparation Program. Educational Curriculum and Instruction.
INSTITUTION Texas A and M Univ., College Station. Coll. of Education.
PUB DATE [82]
GRANT OUR-TAMU-15350-1000
NOTE 34p.; Prepared in the Instructional Research Laboratory. Small print in last seven pages

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement; Classroom Techniques; Competency Based Teacher Education; *Data Collection; Educational Diagnosis; Evaluation Criteria; Higher Education; Instructional Design; *Instructional Systems; *Preservice Teacher Education; Student Teachers; *Student Teaching; Teaching Skills

ABSTRACT

A research program has been initiated at Texas A&M University College of Education to collect, analyze, and interpret data from a diagnostic prescriptive teacher preparation program. The project was undertaken to create a substantial data file containing multiple measures of learner attainment information that will provide alternatives for modeling teacher preparation effects through regression analysis. The program is a competency based program for secondary level teachers that conceptualizes teaching as a series of events requiring five distinct sets of instructional skills: (1) specifying performance objectives; (2) diagnosing learners; (3) selecting instructional strategies; (4) interacting with learners; and (5) evaluating the effectiveness of instruction. Information from 82 secondary level student teachers and 9,001 learners taught by the student teachers comprised the sample for the data base. The student teachers were supervised by five university supervisors over the course of five semesters. A variety of scales and criterion-referenced instruments were used to gather information from the student teachers and the university supervisors. A set of 452 variables were obtained which permit the individual pupil of the student teacher to be the unit of analysis. Tables provide statistical summaries of classroom observation ratings, weekly morale ratings for student teachers, and performances of individual learners. The data sets are reproduced in the appendix. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED221524

A Quantitative Description of a Teacher Preparation Program

Educational Curriculum and Instruction

Instructional Research Laboratory

Jon J. Denton
Professor

Geneva W. Morris
Research Assisiant

This report was made possible through a grant (OUR - TAMU - 15350-1000) from the Organized Research Fund, College of Education Texas A&M University

SP 017 603

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

JON DENTON

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

Research on teacher education while in vogue during the sixties, has nearly disappeared from the professional literature during the past few years. Topics among the reviews of research on teacher education (Denemark & MacDonald, 1967; Peck & Tucker, 1973) from this period addressed instructional approaches, i.e. field experience alternatives, microteaching, self-paced programs; curricular components, namely classroom observation systems, value clarification, behavior modification; and human characteristics including attitudes, personality, and dogmatism of teaching candidates. This body of empirical literature has provided substantial evidence to support the statement that teaching skills can be taught. While this idea is reassuring to those of us who are engaged in teacher education, it does little to instill public confidence in the ability of professional educators to develop theory and establish comprehensive research programs to improve the teaching process. Peck and Tucker (1973) conclude their review with the following plea for creating research programs rather than unitary projects on teacher education:

> We are genuinely in sight of the theoretical principles, the operational measures, and even the developmental technology for moving into a performance-based method of appraising teaching. A great deal of research remains to be done to discover additional theoretical principles which lead to more effective training. ... more expensive evaluative research will be absolutely necessary in order to test and refine instructional systems... [1973, p. 971].

Responding to this request a research program has been initiated to collect, analyze and interpret data from all phases of an operating teacher preparation program based on the diagnostic-prescriptive model of teaching. Specifically, this project was undertaken to create a substantial data file containing multiple measures of learner attainment information. These data will provide many alternatives for modeling

teacher preparation effects through regression analysis.

ORGANIZATION OF INVESTIGATION

Program Description

This investigation was conducted under the auspices of an educational curriculum and instruction department at a Land Grant University. The teacher preparation program which participated in the investigation is a competency based program for secondary level teachers fashioned around a diagnostic prescriptive model of instruction (Armstrong, Denton, Savage, 1978). This model conceptualizes teaching as a series of events requiring five distinct sets of instructional skills, that is: Specifying Performance Objectives, Diagnosing Learners, Selecting Instructional Strategies, Interacting with Learners, and Evaluating the Effectiveness of Instruction.

Specifying Performance Objectives - The decisions inherent in this element of the instructional model are instrumental in determining whether the entire instructional process can be successful in producing student learning. Restated, this idea becomes performance objectives determine the direction and focus of instruction. When performance objectives are selected and sequenced according to a logical plan, teachers are in a position of leadership and can justify their program to responsible critics.

Diagnosing Learners - Teachers need information regarding a learner's readiness to begin a proposed new instructional sequence. Bypassing this step in an effort to save instructional time is false economy, since the result may well be frustrated, bored and unmotivated learners. When adequate diagnostic information is available, instructional plans can be developed that meet the informational and emotional needs of the learners.

Selecting Instructional Strategies - In selecting instructional

strategies teachers should structure activities that are consistent with the identified performance objectives, the entry levels of the learners, and the events of instruction espoused by Gagne' (1970). In a sense, selecting instructional strategies is analogous to generating directional research hypotheses. A strategy is created from a wide range of possible approaches which, in the teacher's mind, will likely bring about learner attainment of the performance objectives. The appropriateness of this strategy is "tested" during the implementation and evaluation phases of instruction.

Interacting with Learners - This component represents the "doing" phase of the instructional model. The elegance of the instructional plan becomes unimportant if the timing and continuity of the classroom activities are interrupted creating disorder and predictable management problems. Thus, learning how to interact with learners is, perhaps, the most difficult set of skills for new teachers to attain. Mastering these skills requires considerable practice in actual classroom settings, and serves to justify the emphasis on student teaching experience in teacher preparation programs.

Evaluating the Effectiveness of Instruction - This component serves to gather evidence during and after the teaching of an instructional plan to determine whether the plan "worked." Evaluation should prompt a review of each component in the instructional model. Representative questions to illustrate this review include: Were the performance objectives appropriate? Were the pretests really diagnostic tools? Did the instructional strategies incorporate the events of

instruction? Was classroom management sufficient to maintain a favorable learning environment? Were the evaluation tools valid for assessing learner growth and program effectiveness?

This model provides a framework that encourages the development of individual teaching styles. Individualized styles are encouraged because evaluation of instruction is based on learner attainment of performance objectives. Given this operating principle, teachers in preparation are free to choose procedures from their own repertoires that they believe will result in high levels of learner performance. Further, teacher responsibility is well served by this model. This responsibility comes not because of the teaching candidate's adherence to a set of "ideal role behaviors," but rather in adapting instructional practice, as necessary, to help learners achieve performance objectives that have been selected.

A full semester-full day student teaching program with twelve semester hours being awarded for successful completion of the experience is the culminating experience in this preparation program. During this experience, each student teacher is required to develop and implement two instructional units each of approximately two weeks duration. The instructional units are to include: performance objectives, a diagnostic pretest to determine whether prerequisite knowledges and skills are present, instructional strategies addressed to each performance objective, and criterion-referenced instruments. These units must be deemed acceptable and appropriate by both the classroom supervising teacher and the university supervisor prior to implementation.

Evaluation of student teachers in this program includes supervisor

ratings based on in-class observations and instructional materials produced by the student teacher. Generally six supervisor ratings are completed during a semester. These ratings are recorded on an Evaluation Profile instrument. It may be of significance that the final evaluation for each student teacher recorded on this instrument represents a consensus rating resulting from a three-way conference between the student teacher, classroom supervisor and university supervisor. In addition, a Curriculum Context Checklist for rating the component of each instructional unit is completed by the university supervisor. Two of these forms are completed during the course of the field experience.

Student teachers are also requested to contribute to the formative evaluation process by completing weekly reflection sheets throughout the semester. Further, summative procedures are conducted by student teachers at the conclusion of each unit, where summaries of learner performances on the pretest, posttest, and objective attainment information are recorded on Summary Evaluation of Unit forms. These self-evaluation experiences are consistent with the final component of the diagnostic-prescriptive model of instruction.

Sample

Information from 82 secondary level student teachers and 9001 learners taught by the student teachers comprised the sample for this data base. These student teachers were supervised by 5 university supervisors over the course of five semesters, i.e. Spring 1978 - 7 student teachers, Fall 1978 - 18 student teachers, Spring 1979 - 19 student teachers, Fall 1979-9 student teachers, Spring 1980 - 29 student teachers. The total number of secondary level student teachers numbered 291 during this period (Spring 78 - 68, Fall 78 - 64, Spring 79 - 52,

Fall 79-52, Spring 80-55). The university supervisors have served in this role from one semester to three years and have established good relationships with classroom supervisors and building administrators in the student teaching sites represented in this project. Moreover, the supervisors are well versed on the diagnostic-prescriptive model of instruction on which the preparation program is based and have held the student teachers accountable for implementing the tenets of this model in their teaching.

Fifty-seven classroom supervisors from 12 school buildings served as the "model teachers" for the student teachers. Five supervisors in this group worked with a student teacher for each of the three semesters the data were collected, while 14 other classroom supervisors served in this capacity for two semesters. Names of these individuals and the student teachers assigned to them are presented in a subsequent section of this report. In order to qualify as a classroom supervisor, these teachers met the following criteria: hold a valid teaching certificate in the field in which they are teaching, have completed 2 full years of public school teaching experience - one of which is in the local district, agree to serve as a classroom supervising teacher for both semesters, and agree to attend the inservice meetings sponsored by the Brazos Valley Cooperative Teacher Education Center and other meetings sponsored by the Department of Educational Curriculum and Instruction at Texas A&M University.

In order to enroll in student teaching each teaching candidate in this sample had met the following criteria:

1. Attained senior standing with at least 30 semester hours completed at TAMU including at least six semester hours in approved professional courses.

2. Attained a minimum grade point ration (GPR) of 2.25 based on the grade report form published by the registrar's office of TAMU.

3. Completed at least 75% of the coursework required for the teaching fields with a minimum GPR of 2.25.

4. Admitted to the teacher education program at least one semester prior to student teaching. The criteria for this criterion include a statement of personal commitment, minimum grade point ratio (2.25), three letters of recommendation, successful completion of English proficiency examination, and *early field exp. course (*only required for EDCI majors).

5. Completed ten hours of professional education coursework (EPSY 301-3 hrs., EDCI 323-3hrs, EDCI 401-7 4 hrs.).

The learners in this sample were the pupils assigned to the classes of the 57 classroom supervisors during the five semester period these data were collected. These learners attended one of the following five school districts in Central Texas, namely:

Bryan	(A.D.A. = 8412)	Hearne	(A.D.A. = 1607)
Caldwell	(A.D.A. = 1263)	Navasota	(A.D.A. = 2005)
College Station	(A.D.A. = 3255)	Katy	(A.D.A. = 6432)

Information is presented in the data file which enables the learners to be grouped by student teacher, building site or school district if desired.

Instrumentation

A variety of scales and criterion-referenced instruments were used to yield information for this data base. One of these instruments, a rating scale entitled, Evaluation Profile was used to obtain instructional effectiveness ratings of the student teacher's performance.

This instrument was completed on a biweekly basis by the university supervisor. The scale, consists of twenty-eight Likert type items divided into two categories, i.e., instructional competencies (21 items), and personal and professional competencies (7 items). Each item on the scale is referenced to a performance objective in the student teaching program. Further, the instructional skills addressed on this instrument are compatible with the skills and knowledges stressed in the diagnostic - prescriptive model of instruction, on which this program is based. The supervisor had the choice of marking one of five categories ranging from excellent = 1, to inadequate = 5. If the skill was not observed or not applicable to the classroom situation the supervisor had the option of marking N/A. An alpha coefficient of .94, determined for this instrument suggests a high degree of internal consistency among responses to the various items.

A second rating scale, the Curriculum Context Checklist, was used to provide university supervisor ratings of the curricular units developed by the student teacher. Values from this scale provided data for the variable, planning effectiveness of the student teacher. This instrument contains a 5 choice scale identical to the scale of the evaluation profiles. Individual items of this instrument identify components of the curriculum unit, e.g., general goals, focusing generalizations, concept list, diagnostic component. In addition, student teachers completed two instruments which served self-evaluation functions and provided time ordered data for this data base. One of these instruments, the Weekly Reflection Sheet requested the student teacher to estimate the percent of time she spent during the preceding week observing, planning, assisting, team teaching, and/or

assuming full responsibility. Unfortunately these data were not obtained during the 1979-80 academic year. Further, the candidates assessed their morale and provided a numerical rating from 1 to 5 regarding their morale accompanied by a written explanation of the rating. These instruments were submitted to the university supervisor at the end of each week throughout the semester.

The second instrument, Summary Evaluation of Unit, was completed by the teaching candidate immediately after completing the instruction associated with each unit. This form required an estimate of the achievement level and socioeconomic level of the learners in addition to the actual number of class periods required to teach the unit. Perhaps the most significant information collected among all data, was recorded on this form by the student teacher. These data being achievement information (learner attainment of individual unit objectives, pretest scores, and unit posttest scores). Criterion-referenced tests developed by the student teacher were used to provide these learner attainment data. These instruments, unique for each unit and each student teacher, represent a strength and potential limitation in the design of this investigation. As a strength, the student teacher with guidance from classroom and university supervisors developed tests related directly to the outcomes established for the performance objectives in each unit. Prior learning, extenuating classroom situations, and the abilities of the learners were taken into account in establishing both the objectives and the corresponding criterion tests. Under these conditions, the cognitive attainment measure indeed did sample the behavior called for in the performance objective.

A potential limitation of candidate-developed criterion-referenced tests for this investigation stems primarily from the lack of information on the reliability and validity of the respective instruments. Conventional reliability procedures appropriate for norm-referenced tests were not determined on the various criterion-referenced tests (determine an individual's performance with respect to the performance of others in the group) (Millman, 1974). Thus, while we are concerned, we are not unduly alarmed by the absence of these values. Validity of criterion-referenced instruments on the other hand, can be assessed by determining the logical relation of the performance objectives and the individual test items. Fortunately, this validity check was conducted by the classroom and university supervisors on each candidate's test before the instrument was administered to the learners.

PERSONNEL

Data obtained from the student teachers and their learners in the sample were ordered, coded and placed in a data file initially by Sherrill Norris, Jim Tooke, and Tom Walker and more recently by Geneva Morris, Lyman Maddox, Ephrim Kazimi and Jon Denton, principal investigator of this project. Task schedules for each of these individuals were established to provide a management system for the project. The tireless efforts of the research assistants offset setbacks encountered in coding and keypunching the data enabling this project to be completed on schedule.

SPSS80 and SPSS80SH

Data files from this effort contains 452 variables with 414 of these being directly related to the student teacher and 38 variables associated with learners of the student teachers. These variables have been organized via the following data menu (Appendix A) and assigned a variable label. While the data are organized by card format, data points are stored on a disk pack with backup systems being available on magnetic tapes (ZY2355, ZY2356).

DATA ANALYSIS

These data files have been established to permit the individual learner to be the unit of analysis. Since the data are ordered by the identification number of the student teachers, the learner data may be combined and considered as data sets of student teachers. Since so many variables have been gathered on the student teachers and learners in this sample, it is expected that some variables will not have values assigned to them from every student teacher or learner. Thus, the following tables (1-6) present descriptive statistics on each variable in the file.

Table 1

Descriptive Statististics for Variables on

Card 1 of DENNOR DATA SET

Var. label	Variable	N	$\bar{X}$	S.D.
IDT	Teacher #			
UN1	Unit Number #1			
GN1	General Goal	80	1.74	.69
FG1	Focusing Generalizations	81	2.76	.99
CL1	Concept List	81	2.07	1.09
POKN1	# of Knowledge P.O.	82	6.05	7.15
POKC1	Components of P.O.			
POR1	P.O. Rating for Unit 1	35	2.37	.91
POSN1	#of Skill Obj. P.O.	82	2.57	4.16
POSC1	Components of Skill Obj			
POR2	P.O. Rating for Unit 2	29	2.24	.87
POAN1	# of Attitude Objectives	82	.55	.77
POAC1	Components of Attitude Obj			
DIA1	Diagnosis (u1)	81	2.76	1.43
REM1	Remediation (u1)	81	3.73	1.52
CONO1	Content Outline	81	2.04	1.20
IST1	Inst. Strategies	81	2.86	1.03
LM1	List of Materials	80	1.81	1.11
SUME1	Summative Evaluation	81	2.70	1.16
FORM1	Formative Evaluation	81	2.48	1.24
SUBJ1	Subject Area			
UN2	Unit #2			
GN2	General Goal	79	1.76	.70
FG2	Focusing Generalization	79	2.66	1.07
CL2	Concept List	78	2.27	1.20
POKN2	# of knowledge P.O.	82	4.83	5.09
POLC2	Components of P.O.			
POSN2	# of skill Obj.	82	2.50	2.65
POSC2	Components of Skill Obj.			
POAN2	# of attitude obj	82	.67	1.02
POAC2	Components of Attitude Obj			
DIA2	Diagnosis (u2)	79	2.97	1.66
REM2	Remediation (u2)	79	3.71	1.73
CONO2	Content Outline	78	2.20	1.39
IST2	Instructional Straties	79	2.83	.99
LM2	List of Materials	77	1.73	1.13
SUME2	Summative Eval	79	2.81	1.20
FORM2	Formative Eval	79	2.54	1.18
SUBJ2	Subj Matter 2nd Unit			
SEX	Sex of S.T.	81	1.80	.40
MAJ	Major of S.T.	79	1.33	.47
AGE	Age of S.T.	74	22.70	3.36
USUP	UNIV. SUPERVISOR	82	1.68	1.02
CSUP	Classroom Supervisor	82	33.40	16.63
01	Card 1			

(Spring 78)

Student Teacher	#	#(of learners)
Blume, Dina	01	43
Gibson, Cindy	02	103
House, Marty	03	100
Ortiz, Wayne	04	87
Sorenson, Cindy	06	107
Townsend, Kristy	07	100
Wester, John	08	87

(Fall 78)

Student Teacher	#	#(of learners)
Bartlett, Paul	09	107
Bobasin, Nancy	10	112
Brown, Vicki	11	108
Bruhr, Darla	12	111
Dugat, Kathy	13	086
Emmert, Janet	14	105
Gaskill, Linda	15	129
Hammond, Terry	16	125
Hale, George	17	120
Harrington Kris	18	086
Ingram, Debbie	19	097
Johnston, Jane	20	139
LaRue, Lee	21	064
Lovett, Barbara	22	130
Malek, Dorothy	23	124
Owen, Melissa	24	142
Smith, Evelyn	25	148
Walker, Tom	27	167
Webber, Dan	28	923
Woods, Gailan	29	031

(Spring 79)

Student Teacher	#	#(of learners)
Beale, Tina	30	113
Broussard, Edmond	31	089
Cater, Alicia	32	087
Gandy, Susan	33	138
Garner, Charlotte	34	085
Gilliland, Gene	35	142
Gray, Linda		
Haskins, Betty		
Hill, Charlotte		
Lantz, Fred	39	119
O'Brian, Karen	40	129
Olivar, Lourdes	41	170
Peters, Steve	42	
Schotchmyr, Laura	43	073
Sebesta, Debra Ann	44	061
Synder, Sandy	45	140
Steele, Carolyn	46	075
Sullivan, Hanna	47	101
Thompson, Karen	48	115
Tillerson, Shirley	49	138
Young, Jane	50	121

(Fall 1979)

Student Teacher	#	#(of learners)
Boenker, Lynn	51	73
Carden, Nancy	52	96
Hood, Tim	53	138
Moore, John	54	115
Daniel, Tammy	55	125
Rabaino, Marsha	56	143
Trombley, Mary	57	79
Wheeler, Tally	58	119
Whisenat, Kim	61	100

(Spring 1980)

Student Teacher	#	#(of learners)
Pullen, Earl	59	79
Rippel, Judy	60	124
Bell, Becky	62	105
Bertino, Diana	63	129
Hale, Julie	64	117
DeClaitt, Sheri	65	127
Runnelly, Dorthy	66	89
Karr, Abbie	67	178
Kellus, Marilyn Jane	68	132
Elkin, Valorie	69	162
Hardin, Ann	70	126
Mason, Jane	71	85
Lapper, Carol	72	134
Taylor, David	73	189
Tscherhart, Janis	74	74
Rivera, Valerie	75	109
Sims, Janet	76	109
Staton, Carol	77	68
Turner, Tanyia	78	109
Parmenter, Tammy	79	151
Smith, Lisa	80	143
Martin, Kay	81	119
Klaus, Debra	82	117
Blough, Rose Ann	83	118
Bradley, Phyllis	84	81
Corso, Ann	85	145
Beckman, Susan	86	131
Pavlicek, Mary	87	92
Rauman, Maria	88	37
Wilson, Luanne	90	127
Vaughn, Terry	91	
Griffin, Chris	92	
Harris, Debbie	93	
Walker, Randy	94	
Carrillo, Edna	95	
Beury, Brenda	96	
Pesek, Karen	97	
Calarella, Debbie	98	

Table 2

Descriptive Statistics for Data on

Card 2 of [illegible]

Var. Label	Variable	N	X	S.D.
	Teacher number	82	8.52	2.66
GR1	Grade Level of unit 1	82	11.17	6.82
PER1	Number of instructional periods in Unit 1	82	63.28	8.21
PERL1	Length of period in minutes	82	2.32	1.60
EACL1	Estimated achievement level of students High=1, Middle=2, Low=3	82	3.27	1.61
SES1	Estimated Socio-Economic level of students Upper=1, Middle to Upper=2, Middle=3, Middle to Lower=4, Lower=5	82	3.37	1.34
GR2	Grade Level of Unit 2	82	9.56	6.57
PER2	Number of instructional periods in Unit 2	82	59.00	61.63
PERL2	Length of period in minutes	82	2.44	2.08
EACL2	Estimated achievement level High=1, Middle=2, Low=3	82	3.45	2.06
SES2	Estimated SES Upper=1, Middle to Upper=2 Middle=3, Middle to Lower=4, Lower=5	78	3.02	.37
OGPR	Overall Grade Point Ratio	75	3.58	.36
PEGPR	Prof. Ed. Grade Point Ratio	76	3.05	.38
TF1GPR	Teaching field 1 Grade Point Ratio	67	3.04	.44
TF2GPR	Teaching field 2 Grade Point Ratio			
SCH	School Name (site of Student Teaching Experience)			
EV1P	Evaluation Profile (1 =)	47	2.00	1.02
EV1P1	Univ Sup rating of use of lesson plan	36	2.36	1.29
EV1P2	Univ Sup rating of use of Per. Objective	32	.22	.61
EV1P3	Univ Sup rating of diagnostics used	31	.16	.64
EV1P4	Univ Sup rating of remediation procedures	41	1.46	1.14
EV1P5	Univ Sup rating of mastery of content	34	1.18	1.06
EV1P6	Univ Sup rating of duplication equipment	32	.40	.91
EV1P7	Univ Sup rating of use of A-V equipment	42	2.40	1.08
EV1P8	Univ Sup rating of introduction & conclusion of lesson	45	2.22	.93
EV1P9	Univ Sup rating of method of instruction	44	2.46	.94
EV1P10	Univ Sup rating of four types of Stimulus Presentation	46	2.90	1.18
EV1P11	Univ Sup rating of use of attending behavior	46	1.89	.90
EV1P12	Univ Sup rating to give clear directions	44	1.61	1.33
EV1P13	Univ Sup rating of use of different levels of questions	47	2.47	1.14
EV1P14	Univ Sup rating of reinforcing techniques	30	1.93	1.31
EV1P15	Univ Sup rating to clarify values	47	2.53	1.02
EV1P16	Univ Sup rating of classroom management	32	.34	.83
EV1P17	Univ Sup rating of evaluation instrument	31	1.00	1.37
EV1P18	Univ Sup rating to evaluate instr. program	31	.97	1.49
EV1P19	Univ Sup rating of self-evaluation	32	.31	.78
EV1P20	Univ Sup rating teaching a two week unit	46	1.85	.76
EV1P21	Univ Sup rating model	38	.97	.69
EV1P22	Univ Sup rating responsibility	33	.73	.54
EV1P23	Univ Sup rating promptness	37	.95	.52
EV1P24	Univ Sup rating personal grooming	38	1.00	.52
EV1P25	Univ Sup rating cooperation	32	.87	.66
EV1P26	Univ Sup rating acceptance of school norms	36	.97	.81
EV1P27	Univ Sup rating energy	65	.58	.83
EV1P28	Univ Sup rating concern for school			

Table 3

Descriptive Statistics for Data on

Card 3 of DENVER

Univ. Supervisor - Evaluation Profile - Ratings

Var. Label	Variable		X	S.D.
	Teacher Number			
EV2P	Evaluation Profile #2 - 2			
EV2P1	Univ Sup rating - lesson plan	44	1.89	.73
EV2P2	Univ Sup rating - per objective	36	2.22	.71
EV2P3	Univ Sup rating - diagnostics used	32	1.27	1.06
EV2P4	Univ Sup rating - remediation procedures	29	.48	.95
EV2P5	Univ Sup rating - mastery of content	44	2.04	.78
EV2P6	Univ Sup rating - duplication equipment	33	1.15	.71
EV2P7	Univ Sup rating - use of A-V equipment	30	.83	1.17
EV2P8	Univ Sup rating - introduction & conclusion of lesson	42	2.43	.89
EV2P9	Univ Sup rating - method of instruction	44	2.41	.76
EV2P10	Univ Sup rating - four types of stimulus presentation	45	2.33	.93
EV2P11	Univ Sup rating - use of attending behavior	44	2.52	.76
EV2P12	Univ Sup rating - to give clear directions	45	1.82	.68
EV2P13	Univ Sup rating - use different levels of questions	44	2.02	1.25
EV2P14	Univ Sup rating - of reinforcing techniques	45	2.44	.89
EV2P15	Univ Sup rating - to clarify values	30	2.30	1.09
EV2P16	Univ Sup rating - of classroom management	45	2.42	.66
EV2P17	Univ Sup rating - of evaluation instruments	31	1.58	.99
EV2P18	Univ Sup rating - to evaluate inst. program	29	1.69	1.47
EV2P19	Univ Sup rating - of self evaluation	31	1.55	1.41
EV2P20	Univ Sup rating - teaching a 2 wk unit	32	.56	.95
EV2P21	Univ Sup rating - modal	44	1.86	.87
EV2P22	Univ Sup rating - responsibility	33	.85	.9
EV2P23	Univ Sup rating - promptness	30	.77	.63
EV2P24	Univ Sup rating - personal grooming	33	.82	.58
EV2P25	Univ Sup rating - cooperation	34	.88	.59
EV2P26	Univ Sup rating - acceptance of schoolnorms	31	.84	.69
EV2P27	Univ Sup rating - energy	33	.85	.67
EV2P28	Univ Sup rating - concern for school	33	.42	.63
EV2P	Evaluation Profile #3 - 3			
EV3P1	Univ Sup rating - lesson plan	52	1.67	.76
EV3P2	Univ Sup rating - per. objective	47	1.91	.77
EV3P3	Univ Sup rating - diagnostics used	43	1.86	.47
EV3P5	Univ Sup rating - mastery of content	51	1.94	.77
EV3P4	Univ Sup rating - remediation procedures	35	1.03	.77
EV3P6	Univ Sup rating - duplication equipment	44	1.23	.71
EV3P7	Univ Sup rating - use of A-V equipment	43	1.37	1.09
EV3P8	Univ Sup rating - introduction & conclusion of lesson	53	1.98	.82
EV2P9	Univ Sup rating - method of instruction	53	2.17	.73
EV3P10	Univ Sup rating - four types of Stimulus presentation	53	1.87	.81
EV3P11	Univ Sup rating - use of attending behavior	53	2.24	.70
EV3P12	Univ Sup rating - to give clear directions	53	1.85	.66
EV3P13	Univ Sup rating - use different levels of questions	53	2.13	.90
EV3P14	Univ Sup rating - of reinforcing techniques	53	2.09	.66
EV3P15	Univ Sup rating - to clarify values	35	2.03	.82
EV3P16	Univ Sup rating - of classroom management	53	2.28	.69
EV3P17	Univ Sup rating - of evaluation instruments	36	1.72	.66
EV3P18	Univ Sup rating - to evaluate inst. program	39	1.92	.84
EV3P19	Univ Sup rating - of self evaluation	38	1.84	.92
EV3P20	Univ Sup rating - teaching a 2 wk unit	38	.26	.68
EV3P21	Univ Sup rating - modal	53	1.49	.61
EV3P22	Univ Sup rating - responsibility	46	.96	.55
EV3P23	Univ Sup rating - promptness	46	.91	.51
EV3P24	Univ Sup rating - personal grooming	46	.89	.38
EV3P25	Univ Sup rating - cooperation	47	1.00	.47
EV3P26	Univ Sup rating - acceptance of schoolnorms	46	.93	.49
EV3P27	Univ Sup rating - energy	46	.93	.53
EV3P28	Univ Sup rating - concern for school	45	.96	.56
EV3P1	Univ Sup rating - lesson plan	39	1.44	.68
EV4P2	Univ Sup rating - per objective	39	1.49	.76
EV4P3	Univ Sup rating - diagnostics used	34	1.44	.61
EV4P4	Univ Sup rating - remediation procedures	23	1.70	.76
EV4P5	Univ Sup rating - mastery of content	38	1.58	.84
EV4P6	Univ Sup rating - duplication equipment	30	1.30	.79
EV4P7	Univ Sup rating - use of A-V equipment	30	1.53	.90
EV4P8	Univ Sup rating - introduction & conclusion of lesson	37	2.05	.70
EV4P9	Univ Sup rating - method of instruction	37	1.31	.81
EV4P10	Univ Sup rating - four types of Stimulus Presentation	38	1.82	.77
EV4P11	Univ Sup rating - use of attending behavior	39	1.87	.69
EV4P12	Univ Sup rating - to give clear directions	38	1.63	.63
EV4P13	Univ Sup rating - use different levels of questions	37	1.78	.92
EV4P14	Univ Sup rating - of reinforcing techniques	39	1.90	.79
EV4P15	Univ Sup rating - to clarify values	63	.88	1.01

Table 4

Descriptive Statistics for Data on

Card 4 of DEMOR

University Supervisor - Evaluation Profile Ratings

Var. Label	Variable	N	X	S.D.
	Teacher number			
EV4P16	Univ Sup rating - classroom management	38	1.89	.73
EV4P17	Univ Sup rating - evaluation instruments	25	1.56	.51
EV4P18	Univ Sup rating - evaluate inst. program	23	1.61	.90
EV4P19	Univ Sup rating - of self evaluation	28	1.50	.76
EV4P20	Univ Sup rating - teaching a 2 wk unit	25	1.[illegible]	.4
EV4P21	Univ Sup rating - model	39	1.49	.60
EV4P22	Univ Sup rating - responsibility	37	.97	.44
EV4P23	Univ Sup rating - promptness	37	.95	.40
EV4P24	Univ Sup rating - personal grooming	37	.95	.40
EV4P25	Univ Sup rating - cooperation	37	1.00	.47
EV4P26	Univ Sup rating - acceptance of school norms	37	.97	.44
EV4P27	Univ Sup rating - energy	37	1.00	.47
EV4P28	Univ Sup rating - concern for school	36	.94	.47
EV5P1	Univ Sup rating - lesson plan	39	1.20	.52
EV5P2	Univ Sup rating - per. objective	39	1.70	.47
EV5P3	Univ Sup rating - diagnostics used	39	1.08	.44
EV5P4	Univ Sup rating - remediation procedures	29	1.48	.63
EV5P5	Univ Sup rating - mastery of content	39	1.41	.50
EV5P6	Univ Sup rating - duplication equipment	35	1.00	.59
EV5P7	Univ Sup rating - use of A-V equipment	35	.94	.68
EV5P8	Univ Sup rating - introduction & conclusion of lesson	39	1.69	.47
EV5P9	Univ Sup rating - method of instruction	39	1.38	.49
EV5P10	Univ Sup rating - four types of stimulus presentation	39	1.51	.68
EV5P11	Univ Sup rating - use of attending behavior	40	1.72	.88
EV5P12	Univ Sup rating - to give clear directions	39	1.31	.57
EV5P13	Univ Sup rating - use different levels of questions	39	1.69	.57
EV5P14	Univ Sup Rating - of reinforcing techniques	39	1.89	.61
EV5P15	Univ Sup rating - to clarify values	29	2.00	.46
EV5P16	Univ Sup rating - of classroom management	39	1.82	.76
EV5P17	Univ Sup rating - of evaluation instruments	29	1.13	.35
EV5P18	Univ Sup rating - to evaluate inst. program	29	1.34	.55
EV5P19	Univ Sup rating - of self evaluation	32	1.59	.98
EV5P20	Univ Sup rating - teaching a 2 wk unit	32	1.06	.43
EV5P21	Univ Sup rating - model	39	1.28	.56
EV5P22	Univ Sup rating - responsibility	28	.82	.61
EV5P23	Univ Sup rating - promptness	28	.71	.46
EV5P24	Univ Sup rating - personal grooming	28	.79	.50
EV5P25	Univ Sup rating - cooperation	28	.79	.50
EV5P26	Univ Sup rating - acceptance of school norms	28	.75	.44
EV5P27	Univ Sup rating - energy	28	.79	.50
EV5P28	Univ Sup rating - concern for school	28	.97	1.07
EV6P	Evaluation Profile #6			
EV6P1	Univ Sup rating - lesson plan	77	1.19	.67
EV6P2	Univ Sup rating - per objective	77	1.23	.43
EV6P3	Univ Sup rating - diagnostics used	77	1.47	.50
EV6P4	Univ Sup rating - remediation procedures	40	1.37	.59
EV5P5	Univ Sup rating - master of content	77	1.25	.46
EV6P6	Univ Sup rating - duplication equipment	77	1.13	.47
EV6P7	Univ Sup rating - use of A-V equipment	77	1.18	.48
EV5P8	Univ Sup rating - introduction & conclusions of lessons	77	1.48	.58
EV6P9	Univ Sup rating - method of instruction	77	1.23	.46
EV6P10	Univ Sup rating - four types of stimulus presentations	77	1.26	.44
EV6P11	Univ Sup rating - use of attending behavior	77	1.64	.63
EV6P12	Univ Sup rating - to give clear directions	77	1.21	.44
EV6P13	Univ Sup rating - use different levels of questions	77	1.49	.60
EV6P14	Univ Sup rating - of reinforcing techniques	77	1.44	.55
EV6P15	Univ Sup rating - to clarify values	41	1.56	.55
EV6P16	Univ Sup rating - of classroom management	77	1.67	.68
EV6P17	Univ Sup rating - of evaluation instruments	77	1.19	.40
EV6P18	Univ Sup rating - to evaluate inst. program	77	1.19	.40
EV6P19	Univ Sup rating - of self evaluation	75	1.21	.41
EV6P20	Univ Sup rating - teaching a 2 wk unit	77	1.03	.16
EV6P21	Univ Sup rating - model	77	1.19	.43
EV6P22	Univ Sup rating - responsibility	77	1.06	.25
EV6P23	Univ Sup rating - promptness	77	1.06	.22
EV6P24	Univ Sup rating - personal grooming	77	1.04	.19
EV6P25	Univ Sup rating - cooperation	77	1.04	.19
EV6P26	Univ Sup rating - acceptance of schoolnorm	77	1.00	0.0
EV6P27	Univ Sup rating - energy	77	1.10	.30
EV6P28	Univ Sup rating - concern for school	73	1.04	.23

Table 5

Descriptive Statistics for Data on

Card 5 of DEMOR

Weekly S.T. Schedule

Var. Label	Variable	N	X	S.D.
	Teacher #			
TIA1	wk1 - Time - % Introd. Activity			
TP1	wk1 - Time - % Planning			
TPA1	wk1 - Time - % Assisting			
	Time - % Team teaching			
TFR1	wk1 - Time - % Full Responsibility			
TSE1	wk1 - Time - % 2nd Environment			
MR1	wk1 - Morale Rating	69	3.87	.97
TIA2	wk2 - Time - % Introd. Activity			
TP2	wk2 - Time - % Planning			
TPA2	wk2 - Time - % Assisting			
TTT2	wk2 - Time - % Team Teaching			
TFR2	wk2 - Time - % Full Responsibility			
TSE2	wk2 - Time - % 2nd Environment			
MR2	wk2 - Morale Rating	74	4.03	.91
TIA3	wk3 - Time - % Introd. Activity			
TP3	wk3 - Time - % Planning			
TPA3	wk3 - Time - % Assisting			
TTT3	wk3 - Time - % Team Teaching			
TFR3	wk3 - Time - % Full Responsibility			
TSE3	wk3 - Time - % 2nd Environment			
MR3	wk3 - Morale Rating	70	3.93	.95
TIA4	wk3 - Time - % Introd. Activity			
TP4	wk3 - Time - % Planning			
TPA4	wk4 - Time - % Assisting			
TTT4	wk4 - Time - % Team Teaching			
TFR4	wk4 - Time - % Full Responsibility			
TSE4	wk4 - Time - % 2nd Environment			
MR4	wk4 - Morale Rating	74	3.84	1.01
TIA5	wk5 - Time - % Introd. Activity			
TP5	wk5 - Time - % Planning			
TPA5	wk5 - Time - % Assisting			
TTT5	wk5 - Time - % Team Teaching			
TFR5	wk5 - Time - % Full Responsibility			
TSE5	wk5 - Time - % 2nd Environment			
MR5	wk5 - Morale Rating	72	3.83	1.11
TIA6	wk6 - Time - % Introd. Activity			
TP6	wk6 - Time - % Planning			
TPA6	wk6 - Time - % Assisting			
TTT6	wk6 - Time - % Team Teaching			
TFR6	wk6 - Time - % Full Responsibility			
TSE6	wk6 - Time - % 2nd Environment			
MR6	wk6 - Morale Rating	70	3.90	.90
TIA7	wk7 - Time - % Introd. Activity			
TP7	wk7 - Time - % Planning			
TPA7	wk7 - Time - % Assisting			
TTT7	wk7 - Time - % Team Teaching			
TFR7	wk7 - Time - % Full Responsibility			
TSE7	wk7 - Time - % 2nd Environment			
MR7	wk7 - Morale Rating			
TIA8	wk8 - Time - % Introd. Activity	74	4.04	.81
TP8	wk8 - Time - % Planning			
TPA8	wk9 - Time - % Assisting			
TTT8	wk8 - Time - % Team Teaching			
TFR8	wk8 - Time - % Full Responsibility			
TSE8	wk8 - Time - % 2nd Environment			
MR8	wk8 - Morale Rating	72	4.15	.83
TIA9	wk9 - Time - % Introd. Activity			
TP9	wk9 - Time - % Planning			
TPA9	wk9 - Time - % Assisting			
TTT9	wk9 - Time - % Team Teaching			
TFR9	wk9 - Time - % Full Responsibility			
TSE9	wk9 - Time - % 2nd Environment			
MR9	wk9 - Morale Rating	72	4.11	.86
TIA10	wk10- Time - % Introd. Activity			
TP10	wk10- Time - % Planning			
TPA10	wk10- Time - % Assisting			
TTT10	wk10- Time - % Team Teaching			
TFR10	wk10- Time - % Full Responsibility			
TSE10	wk10- Time - % 2nd Environment			
MR10	wk10- Morale Rating	64	4.03	.83
TIA11	wk11- Time - % Intro. Activity			
TP11	wk11- Time - % Planning			
TPA11	wk11- Time - % Assisting			
TTT11	wk11- Time - % Team Teaching			
TFR11	wk11- Time - % Full Responsibility			
TSE11	wk11- Time - % 2nd Environment			
MR11	wk11- Morale Rating	69	4.20	.70
TIA12	wk12- Time - % Intro. Activity			
TP12	wk12- Time - % Planning			
TPA12	wk12- Time - % Assisting			
TTT12	wk12- Time - % Team Teaching			
TFR12	wk12- Time - % Full Responsibility			
TSE12	wk12- Time - % 2nd Environment			
MR12	wk12- Morale Rating	61	4.46	.70
TIA13	wk13- Time - % Intro. Activity			
TP13	wk13- Time - % Planning			
TPA13	wk13- Time - % Assisting			
TTT13	wk13- Time - % Team Teaching			
TFR13	wk13- Time - % Full Responsibility			
TSE13	wk13- Time - % 2nd Environment			
MR13	wk13- Morale Rating	53	4.60	.60
TIA14	wk14- Time - % Intro. Activity			
TP14	wk14- Time - % Planning			
TPA14	wk14- Time - % Assisting			
TTT14	wk14- Time - % Team Teaching			
TFR14	wk14- Time - % Full Responsibility			
TSE14	wk14- Time - % 2nd Environment			
MR14	wk14- Morale Rating	34	4.50	.83
TIA15	wk15- Time - % Intro. Activity			
TP15	wk15- Time - % Planning			
TPA15	wk15- Time - % Assisting			
TTT15	wk15- Time - % Team Teaching			
TFR15	wk15- Time - % Full Responsibility			
TSE15	wk15- Time - % 2nd Environment			
MR15	wk15- Morale Rating	43	4.74	.49

Values for the Time based variables were not included because missing values were not excluded from calculations.

Table 6

Descriptive Statistics for

Card 7 of DENNOR

Performance Data on Individual Learners

Var. Label	Variable	N	$\bar{X}$	S.D.
	Teacher #			
LID	Learner ID			
PRE1	PRETEST SCORE UNIT 1 (Raw Score)	5205	28.41	26.50
OB1	UNIT 1 - Objective 1	6960	.70	.46
OB2	UNIT 1 - OBJECTIVE 2	7025	.72	.45
OB3	UNIT 1 - OBJECTIVE 3	7025	.68	.47
OB4	UNIT 1 - OBJECTIVE 4	6838	.69	.47
OB5	UNIT 1 - OBJECTIVE 5	6636	.69	.46
OB6	UNIT 1 - OBJECTIVE 6	5093	.66	.47
OB7	UNIT 1 - OBJECTIVE 7	3572	.72	.45
OB8	UNIT 1 - OBJECTIVE 8	2586	.67	.47
OB9	UNIT 1 - OBJECTIVE 9	1892	.68	.47
OB10	UNIT 1 - OBJECTIVE 10	1376	.63	.48
OB11	UNIT 1 - OBJECTIVE 11	957	.80	.40
OB12	UNIT 1 - OBJECTIVE 12	917	.69	.46
OB13	UNIT 1 - OBJECTIVE 13	673	.65	.48
OB14	UNIT 1 - OBJECTIVE 14	595	.70	.46
OB15	UNIT 1 - OBJECTIVE 15	366	.58	.49
POST1	POSTTEST SCORE (RAW) UNIT 1	6836	60.05	34.60
NOB1	Number of objectives - Unit 1	9001	5.99	4.19
PERACH1	% of total obj. achieved by learner Unit 1	7041	69.44	28.32
PRE2	PRETEST SCORE Unit 2 (Raw Score)	4425	34.18	30.42
OBJ1	UNIT 2 - OBJECTIVE 1	5604	.70	.46
OBJ2	UNIT 2 - OBJECTIVE 2	6607	.67	.47
OBJ3	UNIT 2 - OBJECTIVE 3	6512	.68	.46
OBJ4	UNIT 2 - OBJECTIVE 4	5872	.65	.48
OBJ5	UNIT 2 - OBJECTIVE 5	5258	.63	.48
OBJ6	UNIT 2 - OBJECTIVE 6	4185	.64	.49
OBJ7	UNIT 2 - OBJECTIVE 7	3119	.74	.44
OBJ8	UNIT 2 - OBJECTIVE 8	2410	.76	.43
OBJ9	UNIT 2 - OBJECTIVE 9	1751	.68	.47
OBJ10	UNIT 2 - OBJECTIVE 10	1146	.68	.47
OBJ11	UNIT 2 - OBJECTIVE 11	782	.62	.48
OBJ12	UNIT 2 - OBJECTIVE 12	529	.48	.50
OBJ13	UNIT 2 - OBJECTIVE 13	423	.77	.42
OBJ14	UNIT 2 - OBJECTIVE 14	352	.47	.50
OBJ15	UNIT 2 - OBJECTIVE 15	275	.48	.50
POST2	POSTTEST SCORE (RAW) UNIT 2	6287	61.29	29.29
NOB2	Number of Objectives - Unit 2	9001	5.24	4.12
PERACH2	% of Total obj achieved by learner Unit 2	6609	66.25	30.41

At first glance these tabular summaries are overwhelming because of the sheer volume of numbers, symbols and labels. However if one scans the figures looking for trends and stability across the variables, patterns begin to appear. For example, in table 1 the Supervisor ratings for the unit 1 components are generally better (lower numerical values) than their analogues in unit 2. Additionally, one may note the number of learners taught by the student teachers ranged from 23 to 189, with the mean value being 115.

Tables 2-4 provide summaries of the six classroom observation ratings of the university supervisor gleaned from the Evaluation Profile instrument. One finding from the 168 summaries provided in these tables is the variation in the number of observations across these samples. [The initial observation EV1P contained information from 55 student teachers, while subsequent observations fluctuated, i.e., EV2P-44, EV3P-53, EV4P-63, EV5P-40, EV6P-77.] One reason for this variation across observations is that data collection procedures employed by some of the supervisors yielded values for only the EV3P and EV6P clusters of variables. Further, much of the data collected during the Fall, 1979-Spring, 1980 yielded only the EV6P thus explaining the larger N. Additionally, the measures of central tendency for the individual variables contained in tables 2-4 illustrate marked improvement of the student teachers instructional skills in some instances. To illustrate this observation consider the mean values for the variable, university supervisor rating of classroom management, across the six observations: EV1P16-2.53, EV2P16-2.42, EV3P16-2.28, EV4P16-1.89, EV5P16-1.82, EV6P16-1.67. Recalling that the lower the numerical value the better the rating, one can see gradual improvement over the course of the student teaching semester with respect to the instructional skills related to classroom management.

Directing our attention to table 5, we find numerical values for weekly morale ratings for student teachers. Note the trend from the beginning of the semester through the final week of student teaching is upward (higher value-higher morale). The mid-semester slump of student teacher morale is a well-documented phenomenon, (Morris, et al., 1981) which appears in table 5 as slightly lower mean values for the variables MR3 through MR6.

Finally, table 6 provides summaries of performance of individual learners of the student teachers. For this reason the magnitude of the number of observations in this table is roughly 100 times greater than the N's in tables 1-5. One casual observation regarding the mean values appearing in table 6 is the observed level of objective attainment, which is .65±.15. Stated another way, the average percentage of learners attaining any objective in the initial instructional unit fell between 50 and 80 across all student teachers. This observation nearly holds for the second unit performances as well. Further, it is interesting and perhaps puzzling that cognitive attainment of learners measured in terms of the number of objectives attained (PERACH1 and PERACH2) dropped from 69.44 in unit 1 to 66.25 in unit 2. These observations only brush the surface of the information contained in this data set, and the reader is encouraged to examine the values in tables 1-6 for the purpose of generating questions.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

The intent of this paper has been to provide a general description of both the secondary teacher preparation program in EDCI and the extensive data sets, DENNOR80 and SPSS80SH. For this reason, much has been made about the model of instruction which our program enbraces and the student

teaching experience our candiates complete. It is hoped the background information has provided a context from which to examine the data summaries in tables 1-6. Moreover, given this context and the data summaries, perhaps a number of questions come to mind, which can be answered by analyzing and probing the data set. The research group on teacher education within the department has reviewed the data summaries and have raised the following questions:

(1) Do learners of EDCI majors attain more than learners of non-majors in EDCI?

(2) Is the cognitive attainment of learners markedly different across different student teachers?

(3) Is there a relation between instructional time on task by student teachers to positively influence cognitive attainment among their learners?

(4) How valid are supervisory ratings for predicting the ability of student teachers to positively influence cognitive attainment among their learners?

(5) Can the diagnostic-prescriptive model of instruction be empirically validated given the DENNOR data set?

(6) Do academic characterisitcs of the teaching candidate affect teacher candidate behavior to the extent discernible differences in learner performance result?

(7) What influence does supervisory observations have on teacher candidate morale and subsequent classroom performance?

(8) Is there a qualitative and quantitative difference in the instruction provided across the two units by the student teacher?

(9) Are student teachers equally effective in producing cognitive growth among their learners?

(10) Do classroom supervisors influence the teaching behavior of student teachers sufficiently to bring about variation in cognitive attainment among learners?

(11) Is the systematic model of teaching used in this program defensible from an empirical perspective?

(12) Does the location of the student teaching experience influence the success of teaching candidates in bringing about cognitive growth of their learners?

(13) Does the supervisory experience of the university supervisors and classroom supervisors influence the success of teaching candidates in bringing about cognitive growth of their learners?

(14) Does the variable, teaching field of the student teacher, reveal differences in cognitive attainment of learners of student teachers?

(15) Does the unit of analysis, i.e., learner, student teacher, instructional classes of the student teacher, influence the data summaries for variables of interest?

(16) Do student teachers who teach a greater number of learners perform any differently than student teachers with fewer learners?

These question represent only a small portion of the issues we have begun to think about and explore. As colleagues, we encourage your participation in the research group on teacher education and solicity your thoughts and analyses of the sata in DENNOR. This data set isn't the exclusive property of Denton or Morris it belongs to the research laboratory on instruction. Therefore as participants in the laboratory you have every right to analyze the data and report your findings. The only obligation attached is that an acknowledgement be made that University Research Funds - Texas A&M University were used in conducting the research.

References

Armstrong, D. G.; Denton, J. J.; Savage, T. V. Instructional skills handbook. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, Educational Technology Publications, 1978.

Denemark, G. S., & Macdonald, J. B. Preservice and inservice education of teachers. Review of Educational Research, 1967, 37, 233-247.

Millman, J. Criterion-referenced measurement. In W. J. Popham (Ed.) Evaluation in education: current applications, Berkeley McCutchan Publishing Co., 1974, 311-397.

Morris, J. E. Chissom, B. S., Seaman, A., Tooke, D. J. Study of Student Morale. College Student Journal, Winter, 1981.

Peck, R. F., & Tucker, J. A. Research on teacher education. In R. M. W. Travers (Ed.), Second handbook of research in teaching. Chicago: Rand McNally College Publishing Co., 1973.

Appendix A

DENNOR DATA SET

Card 1

Rating of Units by Univ. Supervisor

Card	Column	Var. label	Variable	Coding Convention
Col	1-2	IDT	Student teacher #	
Col	3	UN1	Unit Number	high low
Col	4	GN1	General Goal	1 - 5 0=N/A
Col	5	FG1	Focusing Generalizations	1 - 5 0=N/A
Col	6	CL1	Concept List	1 - 5 0=N/A
Col	8-9	POKN1	# of Knowledge P.O.	
Col	10-13	POKC1	Components of P.O.	A B C D
Col	14	POR1	P.O. Rating for Unit 1	1 - 5
Col	15-16	POSN1	# of Skill Obj. P.O. (Application-Evaluation)	
Col	17-20	POSC1	Components of Skill Obj	A B C D
Col	21	POR2	P.O. Rating for Unit 2	1 - 5
Col	22-23	POAN1	# of Attitude Objectives	
Col	24-27	POAC1	Components of Attitude Obj	A B C D
Col	28	DIA1	Diagnosis	1 - 5 0=N/A
Col	29	REM1	Remediation	1 - 5
Col	30	CONO1	Content Outline	1 - 5
Col	31	IST1	Inst. Strategies	1 - 5
Col	32	LM1	List of Materials	1 - 5
Col	33	SUME1	Summative Eval	1 - 5
Col	34	FORM1	Formative Eval	1 - 5
Col	35-37	SUBJ1	Subject Area-1st unit	Soc, Sci, Mat, Eng.
Col	38	UN2	Unit #2	2
Col	39	GN2	General Goal	1 - 5
Col	40	FG2	Focusing Generalizations	1 - 5
Col	41	CL2	Concept List	1 - 5
Col	42-43	POKN2	# of Knowledge P.O.	
Col	44-47	POKC2	Components of P.O.	A B C D
Col	48-49	POSN2	# of Skill Obj.	
Col	50-53	POSC2	Components of Skill Obj.	A B C D
Col	54	POAN2	# of Attitude obj	
Col	55-58	POAC2	Components of Attitude Obj	A B C D
Col	59	DIA2	Diagnosis	1 - 5
Col	60	REM2	Remediation	1 - 5
Col	61	CONO2	Content Outline	1 - 5
Col	62	IST2	Inst. Strategies	1 - 5
Col	63	LM2	List of Materials	1 - 5
Col	64	SUME2	Summative Eval	1 - 5
Col	65	FORM2	Formative Eval	1 - 5
Col	66-68	SUBJ2	Subj Area-2nd unit	
Col	69	SEX	Sex of S.T.	male=1, female=2
Col	70	MAJ	Major of S.T.	EDCI=1, NON-EDCI=2
Col	71-72	AGE	Age of S.T.	
Col	73-74	USUP	UNIV. Supervisor	01 - Norris S. 02 - Tooke J. 03 - Finney A. 04 - Dyer A. 05 - Smith V.
Col	75-77	CSUP	Classroom Supervisor	
Col	79-80	01	Card 1	

CSUP - CODE

CSUF - LBBR

(Spring)-78

Student Teacher	#	(Sup Teacher #)
Blume, Dina	01	(015)
Gibson, Cindy	02	(039)
House, Marty	03	(021)
Ortiz, Wayne	04	(040)
Sorenson, Cindy	05	(019)
Townsend, Kristy	07	(010)
Wester, John	08	(027)

(Fall)-78

Student Teacher	#	
Bartlett, Paul	09	(029)
Bobsein, Nancy	10	(026)
Brown, Vicki	11	(032)
Drehr, Darla	12	(013)
Dugat, Kathy	13	(010)
Gammons, Janet	14	(027)
Gaskill, Linda	15	(031)
Hammond, Terry	16	(019) (Spr)
Helm, George	17	(033)
Harrington, Kris	18	(032) (Spr)
Ingram, Debbie	19	(025)
Johnston, Janie	20	(018)
LaRue, Lee	21	(023)
Lovett, Barbara	22	(011)
Malek, Dorothy	23	(028)
Owen, Melissa	24	(036)
Smith Evelyn	25	(015)
Walker, Tom	27	(024)
Webber, Dan	28	(009)
Woods, Gailan	29	(020

(Spring)-79

Student Teacher	#	
Beale, Tina	30	(017)
Broussard, Edmond	31	(027)
Cater, Alicia	32	(025)
Gandy, Susan	33	(018)
Garner, Charlotte	34	(034)
Gilliland, Gene	35	(014)
Gray, Linda	36	(026)
Haskins, Betty	37	(021)
Hill, Charlotte	38	(034)
Lantz, Fred	39	(030)
O'Brian, Karen	40	(022)
Oliver, Lourdes	41	(024)
Peters, Steve	42	(012)
Schotchmer, Laura	43	(009)
Sobesta, Debra Ann	44	(023)
Synder, Sandy	45	(011)
Steele, Carolyn	46	(035)
Sullivan, Nanna	47	(016)
Thompson, Karen	48	(037)
Tillerson, Shirley	49	(036)
Young, Janet	50	(038)

(Fall) 1979

Student Teacher	#	
Boenker, Lynn	51	(041)
Carden, Nancy	52	(042)
Hood, Tim	53	(033)
Moore, John	54	(044)
Daniel, Tammy	55	(045)
Raboine Marsha	56	(046)
Trombley, Mary	57	(047)
Wheeler, Tally	58	(048)
Whisenat, Kim	61	(051)

(Spring) 1980

Student Teacher	#	
Pullen, Earl	59	(049)
Rippel, Judy	60	(050)
Bell, Becky	62	(052)
Bertino, Diana	63	(053)
Nale, Julie	64	(054)
Decluitt Sheri	65	(036)
Munnelly, Dorthy	66	(055)
Karr, Abbie	67	(056)
Kallus, Marilyn Jane	68	(033)
Elkin, Valorie	69	(041)
Hardin, Ann	71	(057)
Mason, Jane	71	(058)
Lepper, Carol	72	(058)
Taylor, David	73	(015)
Tscherhart, Janis	74	(059)
Rivera, Valarie	75	(045)
Sims, Janet	76	(044)
Staten, Carol	77	(049
Turner, Tanyia	78	(035)
Parmenter, Tammy	79	(060)
Smith, Lisa	80	(061)
Martin, Kay	81	(021)
Klaus, Debra	82	(044)
Blough, Rose Ann	83	(062)
Bradley, Phyllis	84	(018)
Corso, Ann	85	(063)
Beckman, Susan	86	(038)
Pavlicek, Mary	87	(064)
Newman, Marie	88	(065)
Wilson, Luanne	90	(066)
*Vaughn, Terry	91	(067)
*Griffin, Chris	92	(068)
*Harris, Debbie	93	(011)
*Walker, Randy	94	(069)
*Carrillo, Edna	95	(070)
*Bourg, Brenda	96	(071)
*Pesek, Karen	97	(072)
*Calarello, Debbie	98	(073)

*Unable to include in study

Fall 1978

Supervising Teachers	#	(Stud. Teachers)
Boyle, James	009	(28, 43)
Daniels, Harry	010	(07, 13)
Dobson, Virginia	011	(22, 45)
Easter, Princess	012	(-, 42)
Faulkner, April	013	(12, -)
Garner, Robert	014	(-, 35)
Hensley, Oneida	015	(01, 25)
Lampe, Clarise	016	(-, 47)
LaMair, Don	017	(-, 30)
Loving, Cathleen	018	(20, 33)
Marquis, Ellen	019	(06, 16)
Marsh, Ida	020	(03, 29)
Palmer, Ann	021	(-, 37)
Pastor, Peggy	022	(-, 40)
Presley, Id	023	(21, 44)

Spring 1979

Supervising Teachers	#	(Stud. Teachers)
Reed, Ralph	024	(27, 41)
Robinson, Harley	025	(19, 32)
Rogers, Linda	026	(10, 36)
Rouse, John	027	(08, 14, 31)
Savell, Jackie	028	(23, -)
Schaffer, Hilton	029	(09, -)
Siebold, Ed	030	(-, 39)
Stanley, Paula	031	(15, -)
Straub, Beverly	032	(11, 18)
St. Clair, Chester	033	(17, -)
Todd, Dona	034	(34, 38)
Tomlinson, Marie	035	(-, 46)
Waldon, Ora	036	(24, 49)
*Yeebow, Bub	037	(-, 48)
*Rivers, G	038	(-, 50)
Marcias, Lisa	039	(02, -)
Jank	040	(04, -)

Fall 1979 - Spring 1980

Supervising Teachers	#	(Stud. Teachers#)
Donaho, Patsy	041	(51, 69)
Guydon, Marta	042	(52,)
Young, John	044	(54, 82)
Jackson, Priscilla	045	(55, 79)
Hirsch, Mary	046	(56,)
Galber, Morris	047	(57,)
Williams, Rita	048	(58,)
Mayo, K.	049	(59,)
Rizzo, D.	050	(60,)
Kieffer, Grace	051	(61,)
Meads, Treva	052	(62,)
York, Nancy	053	(63,)
Noble, P.	054	(64,)
Lampo, C.	055	(65,)
Casey, B.J.	056	(67,)
Bright, Arthur	057	(70,)
Crow, Hattie	058	(72,)
McCord, Marsha	059	(74,)
Price, Joyce	060	(79,)
Sennett, Wilbert	061	(80,)
Saunders, Billy	062	(83,)
Holmes, Colleen	063	(85,)
Dunn, Rosemary	064	(87,)
Walmon Ray	065	(88,)
O'Grady, Suzanne	066	(90,)
*Crenshaw, G.	067	(91)
*Bigham, Opal	068	(92,)
*Ivers, S.	069	(94,)
*Barni, Mary	070	(95,)
*Connell, Etta	071	(96,)
*Caskey, Judy	072	(97,)
*Hurley, K	073	(98,)

*Unable to include in study

Card 2

Summary of Units by Student Teacher
and
Univ. Supervisor - Evaluation Profile Ratings

Card Column	Var. Label	Variable	Coding Convention
Col 1-2		Teacher number	
Col 3-4	GR1	Grade level of unit 1	
Col 5-6	PER1	Number of instructional periods in Unit 1	
Col 7-9	PERL1	Length of period in minutes	
Col 10	EACL1	Estimated achievement level of students High=1, Middle=2, Low=3	
Col 11	SES1	Estimated Socio-Economic level of students Upper=1, Middle to Upper=2, Middle=3, Middle to Lower=4, Lower=5	
Col 12-13	GR2	Grade level of Unit 2	
Col 14-15	PER2	Number of instructional periods in Unit 2	
Col 16-18	PERL2	Length of period in minutes	
Col 19	EACL2	Estimated achievement level High=1, Middle=2, Low=3	
Col 20	SES2	Estimated SES Upper=1, Middle to Upper=2 Middle=3, Middle to Lower=4, Lower=5	
Col 21-24	OGPR	Overall Grade Point Ratio	
Col 25-28	PEGPR	Prof. Ed. Grade Point Ratio	
Col 29-32	TF1GPR	Teaching field 1 Grade Point Ratio	
Col 33-36	TF2GPR	Teaching field 2 Grade Point Ratio	
Col 37-50	SCH	School Name (site of Student Teaching Experience) *	
Col 51	EV1P	Evaluation Profile #1 - 1	
Col 52	EV1P1	Univ Sup rating of use of lesson plan	1 - 5
Col 53	EV1P2	Univ Sup rating of use of Per. Objective	1 - 5
Col 54	EV1P3	Univ Sup rating of diagnostics used	1 - 5
Col 55	EV1P4	Univ Sup rating of remediation procedures	1 - 5
Col 56	EV1P5	Univ Sup rating of mastery o/content	1 - 5
Col 57	EV1P6	Univ Sup rating of duplication equipment	1 - 5
Col 58	EV1P7	Univ Sup rating of use of A-V equipment	1 - 5
Col 59	EV1P8	Univ Sup rating of introduction & conclusion of lesson	1 - 5
Col 60	EV1P9	Univ Sup rating of method of instruction	1 - 5
Col 61	EV1P10	Univ Sup rating of four types of Stimulus presentation	1 - 5
Col 62	EV1P11	Univ Sup rating of use of attending behavior	1 - 5
Col 63	EV1P12	Univ Sup rating to give clear directions	1 - 5
Col 64	EV1P13	Univ Sup rating of use different levels of questions	1 - 5
Col 65	EV1P14	Univ Sup rating of reinforcing techniques	1 - 5
Col 66	EV1P15	Univ Sup rating to clarify values	1 - 5
Col 67	EV1P16	Univ Sup rating of classroom management	1 - 5
Col 68	EV1P17	Univ Sup rating of evaluation instrument	1 - 5
Col 69	EV1P18	Univ Sup rating to evaluate inst. program	1 - 5
Col 70	EV1P19	Univ Sup rating of self-evaluation	1 - 5
Col 71	EV1P20	Univ Sup rating teaching a two week unit	1 - 5
Col 72	EV1P21	Univ Sup rating model	1 - 5
Col 73	EV1P22	Univ Sup rating responsibility	1 - 5
Col 74	EV1P23	Univ Sup rating promptness	1 - 5
Col 75	EV1P24	Univ Sup rating personal groom	1 - 5
Col 76	EV1P25	Univ Sup rating cooperation	1 - 5
Col 77	EV1P26	Univ Sup rating acceptance of school norms	1 - 5
Col 78	EV1P27	Univ Sup rating energy	1 - 5
Col 79	EV1P28	Univ Sup rating concern for school	1 - 5
Col 80		Card 2	

*SCH - CODE

A	M	H	I	G	- - - - - A&M High
A	M	M	I	D	- - - - - A&M Middle
B	R	Y	A	N	- - - - - Bryan
C	A	L	H	I	- - - - - Caldwell High
C	A	L	J	R	- - - - - Caldwell Middle
H	E	A	R	N	- - - - - Hearne High
J	O	N	E	S	- - - - - Anson Jones
K	A	T	Y	H	- - - - - Katy High
K	A	T	Y	J	- - - - - Katy Junior High
N	A	V	A	I	- - - - - Navasota High
N	A	V	A	D	- - - - - Navasota Middle
S	F	A	U	S	- - - - - S. F. Austin

Card 3

Univ. Supervisor - Evaluation Profile - Ratings (cont)

Card Column	Var. Label	Variable	Coding Convention
			high low
Col 1-2		Teacher number	
Col 4	EV2P	Evaluation Profile #2 = 2	
Col 5	EV2P1	Univ Sup rating - lesson plan	1 - 5
Col 6	EV2P2	Univ Sup rating - per. objective	1 - 5
Col 7	EV2P3	Univ Sup rating - diagnostics used	1 - 5
Col 8	EV2P4	Univ Sup rating - remediation procedures	1 - 5
Col 9	EV2P5	Univ Sup rating - master of content	1 - 5
Col 10	EV2P6	Univ Sup rating - duplication equipment	1 - 5
Col 11	EV2P7	Univ Sup rating - use of A-V equipment	1 - 5
Col 12	EV2P8	Univ Sup rating - introduction & conclusion of lesson	1 - 5
Col 13	EV2P9	Univ Sup rating - method of instruction	1 - 5
Col 14	EV2P10	Univ Sup rating - four types of Stimulus presentation	
Col 15	EV2P11	Univ Sup rating - use of attending behavior	1 - 5
Col 16	EV2P12	Univ Sup rating - to give clear directions	1 - 5
Col 17	EV2P13	Univ Sup rating - use different levels of questions	1 - 5
Col 18	EV2P14	Univ Sup rating - of reinforcing techniques	
Col 19	EV2P15	Univ Sup rating - to clarify values	1 - 5
Col 20	EV2P16	Univ Sup rating - of classroom management	1 - 5
Col 21	EV2P17	Univ Sup rating - of evaluation instruments	1 - 5
Col 22	EV2P18	Univ Sup rating - to evaluate inst. program	1 - 5
Col 23	EV2P19	Univ Sup rating - of self evaluation	1 - 5
Col 24	EV2P20	Univ Sup rating - teaching a 2 wk unit	1 - 5
Col 25	EV2P21	Univ Sup rating - model	1 - 5
Col 26	EV2P22	Univ Sup rating - responsibility	1 - 5
Col 27	EV2P23	Univ Sup rating - promptness	1 - 5
Col 28	EV2P24	Univ Sup rating - personal grooming	1 - 5
Col 29	EV2P25	Univ Sup rating - cooperation	1 - 5
Col 30	EV2P26	Univ Sup rating - acceptance of schoolnorms	1 - 5
Col 31	EV2P27	Univ Sup rating - energy	1 - 5
Col 32	EV2P28	Univ Sup rating - concern for school	1 - 5
Col 34	EV3P	Evaluation Profile #3 = 3	
Col 35	EV3P1	Univ Sup rating - lesson plan	1 - 5
Col 36	EV3P2	Univ Sup rating - per. objective	1 - 5
Col 37	EV3P3	Univ Sup rating - diagnostics used	1 - 5
Col 38	EV3P4	Univ Sup rating - remediation procedures	1 - 5
Col 39	EV3P5	Univ Sup rating - mastery of content	1 - 5
Col 40	EV3P6	Univ Sup rating - duplication equipment	1 - 5
Col 41	EV3P7	Univ Sup rating - use of A-V equipment	1 - 5
Col 42	EV3P8	Univ Sup rating - introduction & conclusion of lesson	1 - 5
Col 43	EV3P9	Univ Sup rating - method of instruction	1 - 5
Col 44	EV3P10	Univ Sup rating - four types of Stimulus presentation	1 - 5
Col 45	EV3P11	Univ Sup rating - use of attending behavior	1 - 5
Col 46	EV3P12	Univ Sup rating - to give clear directions	1 - 5
Col 47	EV3P13	Univ Sup rating - use different levels of questions	1 - 5
Col 48	EV3P14	Univ Sup rating - of reinforcing techniques	1 - 5
Col 49	EV3P15	Univ Sup rating - to clarify values	1 - 5
Col 50	EV3P16	Univ Sup rating - of classroom management	1 - 5
Col 51	EV3P17	Univ Sup rating - of evaluation instruments	1 - 5
Col 52	EV3P18	Univ Sup rating - to evaluate inst. program	1 - 5
Col 53	EV3P19	Univ Sup rating - of self evaluation	1 - 5
Col 54	EV3P20	Univ Sup rating - teaching a 2 wk unit	1 - 5
Col 55	EV3P21	Univ Sup rating - model	1 - 5
Col 56	EV3P22	Univ Sup rating - responsibility	1 - 5
Col 57	EV3P23	Univ Sup rating - promptness	1 - 5
Col 58	EV3P24	Univ Sup rating - personal grooming	1 - 5
Col 59	EV3P25	Univ Sup rating - cooperation	1 - 5
Col 60	EV3P26	Univ Sup rating - acceptance of schoolnorms	1 - 5
Col 61	EV3P27	Univ Sup rating - energy	1 - 5
Col 62	EV3P28	Univ Sup rating - concern for school	1 - 5
Col 64	EV4P	Evaluation Profile #4 = 4	
Col 65	EV4P1	Univ Sup rating - lesson plan	1 - 5
Col 66	EV4P2	Univ Sup rating - per objective	1 - 5
Col 67	EV4P3	Univ Sup rating - diagnostics used	1 - 5
Col 68	EV4P2	Univ Sup rating - remediation procedures	1 - 5
Col 69	EV4P5	Univ Sup rating - mastery of content	1 - 5
Col 70	EV4P6	Univ Sup rating - duplication equipment	1 - 5
Col 71	EV4P7	Univ Sup rating - use of A-V equipment	1 - 5
Col 72	EV4P8	Univ Sup rating - introduction & conclusion of lesson	1 - 5
Col 73	EV4P9	Univ Sup rating - method of instruction	1 - 5
Col 74	EV4P10	Univ Sup rating - four types of Stimulus presentation	1 - 5
Col 75	EV4P11	Univ Sup rating - use of attending behavior	1 - 5
Col 76	EV4P12	Univ Sup rating - to give clear directions	1 - 5
Col 77	EV4P13	Univ Sup rating - use different levels of questions	1 - 5
Col 78	EV4P14	Univ Sup rating - of reinforcing techniques	1 - 5
Col 79	EV4P15	Univ Sup rating - to clarify values	1 - 5
Col 80		Card 3	

Card 4

Weekly S.T. Schedule

Card Column	Var. Label	Variable	Coding Convention
Col 1-2		Teacher number	
Col 4	EV4P16	Univ Sup rating - classroom management	1 - 5
Col 5	EV4P17	Univ Sup rating - evaluation instruments	1 - 5
Col 6	EV4P18	Univ Sup rating - evaluate inst. program	1 - 5
Col 7	EV4P19	Univ Sup rating - of self evaluation	1 - 5
Col 8	EV4P20	Univ Sup rating - teaching a 2 wk unit	1 - 5
Col 9	EV4P21	Univ Sup rating - model	1 - 5
Col 10	EV4P22	Univ Sup rating - responsibility	1 - 5
Col 11	EV4P23	Univ Sup rating - promptness	1 - 5
Col 12	EV4P24	Univ Sup rating - personal grooming	1 - 5
Col 13	EV4P25	Univ Sup rating - cooperation	1 - 5
Col 14	EV4P26	Univ Sup rating - acceptance of school norms	1 - 5
Col 15	EV4P27	Univ Sup rating - energy	1 - 5
Col 16	EV4P28	Univ Sup rating - concern for school	1 - 5
	EV5P	Evaluation Profile #5	
Col 17	EV5P1	Univ Sup rating - lesson plan	1 - 5
Col 18	EV5P2	Univ Sup rating - per. objective	1 - 5
Col 19	EV5P3	Univ Sup rating - diagnostics used	1 - 5
Col 20	EV5P4	Univ Sup rating - remediation procedures	1 - 5
Col 21	EV5P5	Univ Sup rating - mastery of content	1 - 5
Col 22	EV5P6	Univ Sup rating - duplication equipment	1 - 5
Col 23	EV5P7	Univ Sup rating - use of A-V equipment	
Col 24	EV5P8	Univ Sup rating - introduction & conclusion of lesson	1 - 5
	EV5P9	Univ Sup rating - method of instruction	1 - 5
Col 25	EV5P10	Univ Sup rating - four types of stimulus presentation	1 - 5
Col 26		Univ Sup rating - use of attending behavior	1 - 5
Col 27	EV5P11	Univ Sup rating - to give clear directions	1 - 5
Col 28	EV5P12	Univ Sup rating - use different levels of questions	1 - 5
Col 29	EV5P13	Univ Sup rating - of reinforcing techniques	1 - 5
	EV5P14	Univ Sup rating - to clarify values	1 - 5
Col 30	EV5P15	Univ Sup rating - of classroom management	1 - 5
Col 31	EV5P16	Univ Sup rating - of evaluation instruments	1 - 5
Col 32	EV5P17	Univ Sup rating - to evaluate inst. program	1 - 5
Col 33	EV5P18	Univ Sup rating - of self evaluation	1 - 5
Col 34	EV5P19	Univ Sup rating - teaching a 2 wk unit	1 - 5
Col 35	EV5P20	Univ Sup rating - model	1 - 5
Col 36	EV5P21	Univ Sup rating - responsibility	1 - 5
Col 37	EV5P22	Univ Sup rating - promptness	1 - 5
Col 38	EV5P23	Univ Sup rating - personal grooming	1 - 5
Col 39	EV5P24	Univ Sup rating - cooperation	1 - 5
Col 40	EV5P25	Univ Sup rating - acceptance of school norms	1 - 5
Col 41	EV5P26	Univ Sup rating - energy	1 - 5
Col 42	EV5P27	Univ Sup rating - concern for school	1 - 5
Col 43	EV5P28	Evaluation Profile #6	
Col 44	EV6P	Univ Sup rating - lesson plan	1 - 5
Col 45	EV6P1	Univ Sup rating - per objective	1 - 5
Col 46	EV6P2	Univ Sup rating - diagnostics used	1 - 5
Col 47	EV6P3	Univ Sup rating - remediation procedures	1 - 5
Col 48	EV6P4	Univ Sup rating - master of content	1 - 5
Col 49	EV6P5	Univ Sup rating - duplication equipment	1 - 5
Col 50	EV6P6	Univ Sup rating - use of A-V equipment	1 - 5
Col 51	EV6P7	Univ Sup rating - introduction & conclusion of lessons	1 - 5
Col 52	EV6P8	Univ Sup rating - method of instruction	1 - 5
Col 53	EV6P9	Univ Sup rating - four types of stimulus presentations	1 - 5
Col 54	EV6P10	Univ Sup rating - use of attending behavior	1 - 5
Col 55	EV6P11	Univ Sup rating - to give clear directions	1 - 5
Col 56	EV6P12	Univ Sup rating - use different levels of questions	1 - 5
Col 57	EV6P13	Univ Sup rating - of reinforcing techniques	1 - 5
Col 58	EV6P14	Univ Sup rating - to clarify values	1 - 5
Col 59	EV6P15	Univ Sup rating - of classroom management	1 - 5
Col 60	EV6P16	Univ Sup rating - of evaluation instruments	1 - 5
Col 61	EV6P17	Univ Sup rating - to evaluate inst. program	1 - 5
Col 62	EV6P18	Univ Sup rating - of self evaluation	1 - 5
Col 63	EV6P19	Univ Sup rating - teaching a 2 wk unit	1 - 5
Col 64	EV6P20	Univ Sup rating - model	1 - 5
Col 65	EV6P21	Univ Sup rating - responsibility	1 - 5
Col 66	EV6P22	Univ Sup rating - promptness	1 - 5
Col 67	EV6P23	Univ Sup rating - personal grooming	1 - 5
Col 68	EV6P24	Univ Sup rating - cooperation	1 - 5
Col 69	EV6P25	Univ Sup rating - acceptance of school norms	1 - 5
Col 70	EV6P26	Univ Sup rating - energy	1 - 5
Col 71	EV6P27	Univ Sup rating - concern for school	1 - 5
Col 72	EV6P28		
Col 73		Card 4	
Col 79-80	04		

Card 5

Weekly S.T. Schedule

Card Columns	Var. Label	Variable	Coding Conventions
Col 1-2		Teacher #	
Col 4	TIA1	wk1 - Time - % Introd. Activity	0-04%
Col 5	TP1	wk1 - Time - % Planning	1-5-10%
Col 6	TPA1	wk1 - Time - % Assisting	2-20%
Col 7	TTT1	wk1 - Time - % Team Teaching	3-30%
Col 8	TFR1	wk1 - Time - % Full Responsibility	4-40%
Col 9	TSE1	wk1 - Time - % 2nd Environment	5-50%
Col 10	MR1	wk1 - Morale Rating	6-60%
Col 11	TIA2	wk2 - Time - % Introd. Activity	7-70%
Col 12	TP2	wk2 - Time - % Planning	8-80%
Col 13	TPA2	wk2 - Time - % Assisting	9-90-100%
Col 14	TTT2	wk2 - Time - % Team Teaching	
Col 15	TFR2	wk2 - Time - % Full Responsibility	
Col 16	TSE2	wk2 - Time - % 2nd Environment	
Col 17	MR2	wk2 - Morale Rating	
Col 18	TIA3	wk3 - Time - % Introd. Activity	
Col 19	TP3	wk3 - Time - % Planning	
Col 20	TPA3	wk3 - Time - % Assisting	
Col 21	TTT3	wk3 - Time - % Team Teaching	
Col 22	TFR3	wk3 - Time - % Full Responsibility	
Col 23	TSE3	wk3 - Time - % 2nd Environment	
Col 24	MR3	wk3 - Morale Rating	
Col 25	TIA4	wk4 - Time - % Introd. Activity	
Col 26	TP4	wk4 - Time - % Planning	
Col 27	TPA4	wk4 - Time - % Assisting	
Col 28	TTT4	wk4 - Time - % Team Teaching	
Col 29	TFR4	wk4 - Time - % Full Responsibility	
Col 30	TSE4	wk4 - Time - % 2nd Environment	
Col 31	MR4	wk4 - Morale Rating	
Col 32	TIA5	wk5 - Time - % Introd. Activity	
Col 33	TP5	wk5 - Time - % Planning	
Col 34	TPA5	wk5 - Time - % Assisting	
Col 35	TTT5	wk5 - Time - % Team Teaching	
Col 36	TFR5	wk5 - Time - % Full Responsibility	
Col 37	TSE5	wk5 - Time - % 2nd Environment	
Col 38	MR5	wk5 - Morale Rating	
Col 39	TIA6	wk6 - Time - % Introd. Activity	
Col 40	TP6	wk6 - Time - % Planning	
Col 41	TPA6	wk6 - Time - % Assisting	
Col 42	TTT6	wk6 - Time - % Team Teaching	
Col 43	TFR6	wk6 - Time - % Full Responsibility	
Col 44	TSE6	wk6 - Time - % 2nd Environment	
Col 45	MR6	wk6 - Morale Rating	
Col 46	TIA7	wk7 - Time - % Introd. Activity	
Col 47	TP7	wk7 - Time - % Planning	
Col 48	TPA7	wk7 - Time - % Assisting	
Col 49	TTT7	wk7 - Time - % Team Teaching	
Col 50	TFR7	wk7 - Time - % Full Responsibility	
Col 51	TSE7	wk7 - Time - % 2nd Environment	
Col 52	MR7	wk7 - Morale Rating	
Col 53	TIA8	wk8 - Time - % Introd, Activity	
Col 54	TP8	wk8 - Time - % Planning	
Col 55	TPA8	wk8 - Time - % Assisting	
Col 56	TTT8	wk8 - Time - % Team Teaching	
Col 57	TFR8	wk8 - Time - % Full Responsibility	
Col 58	TSE8	wk8 - Time - % 2nd Environment	
Col 59	MR8	wk8 - Morale Rating	
Col 60	TIA9	wk9 - Time - % Introd. Activity	
Col 61	TP9	wk9 - Time - % Planning	
Col 62	TPA9	wk9 - Time - % Assisting	
Col 63	TTT9	wk9 - Time - % Team Teaching	
Col 64	TFR9	wk9 - Time - % Full Responsibility	
Col 65	TSE9	wk9 - Time - % 2nd Environment	
Col 66	MR9	Wk9 - Morale Rating	
Col 67	TIA10	wk10- Time - % Introd. Activity	
Col 68	TP10	wk10- Time - % Planning	
Col 69	TPA10	wk10- Time - % Assisting	
Col 70	TTT10	wk10- Time - % Team Teaching	
Col 71	TFR10	wk10- Time - % Full Responsibility	
Col 72	TSE10	wk10- Time - % 2nd Environment	
Col 73	MR10	wk10- Morale Rating	
Col 79-80	05	Card 5	

Card 6

Weekly S.T. Schedule (Cont)

Card Column	Var. Label	Variable	Coding Convention
Col 1-2		Teacher #	
Col 4	TIA11	wk11 - Time - % Introd. Activity	0-04%
Col 5	TP11	wk11 - Time - % Planning	1=5-10%
Col 6	TPA11	wk11 - Time - % Assisting	2-20%
Col 7	TTT11	wk11 - Time - % Team Teaching	3-30%
Col 8	TFR11	wk11 - Time - % Full Responsibility	4=40%
Col 9	TSE11	wk11 - Time - % 2nd Environment	5=50%
Col 10	MR11	wk11 - Morale Rating	6-60%
Col 11	TIA12	wk12 - Time - % Introd. Activity	7=70%
Col 12	TP12	wk12 - Time - % Planning	8=80%
Col 13	TPA12	wk12 - Time - % Assisting	9=90-100%
Col 14	TTT12	wk12 - Time - % Team Teaching	
Col 15	TFR12	wk12 - Time - % Full Responsibility	
Col 16	TSE12	wk12 - Time - % 2nd Environment	
Col 17	MR12	wk12 - Morale Rating	
Col 18	TIA13	wk13 - Time - % Introd. Activity	
Col 19	TP13	wk13 - Time - % Planning	
Col 20	TPA13	wk13 - Time - % Assisting	
Col 21	TTT13	wk13 - Time - % Team Teaching	
Col 22	TFR13	wk13 - Time - % Full Responsibility	
Col 23	TSE13	wk13 - Time - % 2nd Environment	
Col 24	MR13	wk13 - Morale Rating	
Col 25	TIA14	wk14 - Time - % Introd. Activity	
Col 26	TP14	wk14 - Time - % Planning	
Col 27	TPA14	wk14 - Time - % Assisting	
Col 28	TTT14	wk14 - Time - % Team Teaching	
Col 29	TFR14	wk14 - Time - % Full Responsibility	
Col 30	TSE14	wk14 - Time - % 2nd Environment	
Col 31	MR14	wk14 - Morale Rating	
Col 32	TIA15	wk15 - Time - % Introd. Activity	
Col 33	TP15	wk15 - Time - % Planning	
Col 34	TPA15	wk15 - Time - % Assisting	
Col 35	TTT15	wk15 - Time - % Team Teaching	
Col 36	TFR15	wk15 - Time - % Full Responsibility	
Col 37	TSE15	wk15 - Time - % 2nd Environment	
Col 38	MR15	wk15 - Morale Rating	
Col 79-80	06	Card 6	

Card 7

Performance Data on Individual Learners

Card Column	Var. Label	Variable	Coding Convention
Col 1-2		Teacher #	
Col 3-5	LID	Learner ID#	
Col 7-9	PRE1	PRETEST SCORE UNIT 1 (RAW SCORE)	
Col 10	OB1	UNIT 1 - OBJECTIVE 1	Coding convention
Col 11	OB2	UNIT 1 - OBJECTIVE 2	Obj achieved = 1
Col 12	OB3	UNIT 1 - OBJECTIVE 3	Obj not achieved = 0
Col 13	OB4	UNIT 1 - OBJECTIVE 4	
Col 14	OB5	UNIT 1 - OBJECTIVE 5	
Col 15	OB6	UNIT 1 - OBJECTIVE 6	
Col 16	OB7	UNIT 1 - OBJECTIVE 7	
Col 17	OB8	UNIT 1 - OBJECTIVE 8	
Col 18	OB9	UNIT 1 - OBJECTIVE 9	
Col 19	OB10	UNIT 1 - OBJECTIVE 10	
Col 20	OB11	UNIT 1 - OBJECTIVE 11	
Col 21	OB12	UNIT 1 - OBJECTIVE 12	
Col 22	OB13	UNIT 1 - OBJECTIVE 13	
Col 23	OB14	UNIT 1 - OBJECTIVE 14	
Col 24	OB15	UNIT 1 - OBJECTIVE 15	
Col 25-27	POST1	POSTTEST SCORE (RAW) UNIT 1	
Col 28-29	NOB1	Number of objectives - Unit 1	
Col 30-31	PERACH1	% of total obj. achieved by learner Unit 1	
Col 32			
Col 33-35	PRE2	PRETEST SCORE Unit 2 (Raw Score)	
Col 36	OBJ1	UNIT 2 - OBJECTIVE 1	Coding convention
Col 37	OBJ2	UNIT 2 - OBJECTIVE 2	Obj. achieved = 1
Col 38	OBJ3	UNIT 2 - OBJECTIVE 3	Obj. not achieved = 0
Col 39	OBJ4	UNIT 2 - OBJECTIVE 4	
Col 40	OBJ5	UNIT 2 - OBJECTIVE 5	
Col 41	OBJ6	UNIT 2 - OBJECTIVE 6	
Col 42	OBJ7	UNIT 2 - OBJECTIVE 7	
Col 43	OBJ8	UNIT 2 - OBJECTIVE 8	
Col 44	OBJ9	UNIT 2 - OBJECTIVE 9	
Col 45	OBJ10	UNIT 2 - OBJECTIVE 10	
Col 46	OBJ11	UNIT 2 - OBJECTIVE 11	
Col 47	OBJ12	UNIT 2 - OBJECTIVE 12	
Col 48	OBJ13	UNIT 2 - OBJECTIVE 13	
Col 49	OBJ14	UNIT 2 - OBJECTIVE 14	
Col 50	OBJ15	UNIT 2 - OBJECTIVE 15	
Col 51-53	POST2	POSTTEST SCORE (RAW) UNIT 2	
Col 54-55	NOB2	Number of Objectives - Unit 2	
Col 56-57	PERACH2	% of Total obj. achieved by learner Unit 2	
Col 79-80	7	Card 7	

Card 8 - Blank

[Available for future data expansion]